Application No. 10/664,013
Amendment dated March 1, 2007
Response to Office Action of February 8, 2007

Atty. Docket No. 42P17653
Examiner Sim, Yong H.
TC/A.U. 2629

Amendments to the Figures

The attached sheet of figures includes changes to Fig. 5. This sheet replaces the original sheet including Fig. 5.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 1, 10, 11-13 and 20 have been amended. Claims 9 and 27-54 have been canceled. No claims have been added. Thus, claims 1-8 and 10-26 are pending.

OBJECTIONS TO THE DRAWINGS

The drawings were objected to for failing to show every feature of the claims. Proposed amendments to Figure 5 are submitted herewith. Applicants request that, in view of the amendments to Figure 5, the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claims 9 and 12 were rejected as being indefinite. Claims 9 has been canceled and claim 12 has been amended. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejections of claims 9 and 12 as being indefinite be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 13, 17, 18, 20, 24 and 31 were rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,148,103 issued to Nenonen (*Nenonen*). Claim 31 has been canceled. Therefore, the rejection of claim 31 is moot. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 13, 17, 18, 20 and 24 are not anticipated by *Nenonen*.

Claim 1 recites:

Application No. 10/664,013
Amendment dated March 1, 2007
Response to Office Action of February 8, 2007

Atty. Docket No. 42P17653
Examiner Sim, Yong H.
TC/A.U. 2629

a set of registers where each register has a corresponding to computed brightness value to store data indicating a number of pixels of an image having respective computed brightness values, each register having an associated saturation threshold value; and

an image brightness agent communicatively coupled with the set of registers to determine whether a register is saturated and, for each register that is saturated to redistribute computed brightness values to a closest non-saturated register and if none of the registers is saturated to adjust image brightness and corresponding backlight intensity based on an ambient light level.

Claim 13 recites:

storing, in a plurality of registers, an indication of a number of pixels in an image having a computed brightness value corresponding to the respective registers;

redistributing a subset of computed brightness values corresponding to closest non-saturate registers if the computed brightness value for the register exceeds a threshold value; and

adjusting image brightness and corresponding backlight intensity based on an ambient light level if none of the registers is saturated.

Claim 20 recites similar limitations. Thus, Applicants claim redistributing computed brightness values based on whether a register is saturated and if no registers are saturated, adjusting the image brightness and corresponding backlight intensity based on an ambient light level.

Nenonen is cited to teach redistribution of brightness values. The redistribution of *Nenonen* appears to be different than the redistribution as claimed. Further, *Nenonen* does not teach adjusting the image brightness and corresponding backlight intensity based on an ambient light level if no registers are saturated. Therefore, *Nenonen* cannot anticipate the invention as claimed in claim 1, 13 and 20.

Claims 5, 7 and 8 depend from claim 1. Claims 17 and 18 depend from claim 13. Claim 24 depends from claim 20. Because dependent claims include the limitations of

Application No. 10/664,013
Amendment dated March 1, 2007
Response to Office Action of February 8, 2007

Atty. Docket No. 42P17653
Examiner Sim, Yong H.
TC/A.U. 2629

the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 5, 7, 8, 17, 18 and 24

are not anticipated by *Nenonen* for at least the reasons set forth above.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 2-4, 9-12, 14-16, 19, 21-23, 26, 28-30 and 33-54 were rejected as being

unpatentable over *Nenonen* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,760,760 issued to Helms

(*Helms*). Claims 9, 28-30 and 33-54 have been canceled. Therefore, the rejection of

claims 9, 28-30 and 33-54 is moot. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants

submit that claims 2-4, 10-12, 14-16, 19, 21-23 and 26 are not rendered obvious by

Nenonen and *Helms*.

Each of claims 2-4, 10-12, 14-16, 19, 21-23 and 26 depends from an independent

claim discussed above. As discussed above, *Nenonen* fails to disclose a recited limitation

of the independent claim. *Helms* does not cure the deficiency of *Nenonen* set forth

above. Therefore, even if the combination of *Nenonen* and *Helms* is proper, the

combination does not result in the invention as claimed in claims 2-4, 10-12, 14-16, 19,

21-23 and 26. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 2-4, 10-12,

14-16, 19, 21-23 and 26 as being rendered obvious by *Nenonen* and *Helms* be withdrawn.

Claims 6, 25, 27 and 32 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Nenonen*.

Claims 27 and 32 have been canceled. Therefore, the rejection of claims 27 and 32 is

moot. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 6 and 25 are

not rendered obvious by *Nenonen*.

Each of claims 6 and 25 depends from an independent claim discussed above. As

discussed above, *Nenonen* fails to disclose a recited limitation of the independent claim.

Application No. 10/664,013
Amendment dated March 1, 2007
Response to Office Action of February 8, 2007

Atty. Docket No. 42P17653
Examiner Sim, Yong H.
TC/A.U. 2629

Nothing in Nenonen suggests the modifications necessary to result in the invention as claimed in claims 6 and 25. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 6 and 25 as being rendered obvious by *Nenonen* be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-8 and 10-26 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: March 1, 2007   /Paul A. Mendonsa/
Paul A. Mendonsa
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 42,879

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 439-8778

Attachments

-13-

Application No. 10/664,013
Amendment dated March 1, 2007
Response to Office Action of February 8, 2007

Atty. Docket No. 42P17653
Examiner Sim, Yong H.
TC/A.U. 2629

Appendix